

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/865,570	Applicant(s) OZEKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Kyle M Pendergrass	Art Unit 2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Kyle M Pendergrass. (3) Eliot R. Malamud.
 (2) King Poon. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 February 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All. EMPHASIS ON claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Shimizu et al. (US 5,872,869)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed whether the optical fiber of Shimizu meet the claimed limitation of claim 1.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant's Representative

submits that the disclosure of Shimizu does not disclose components of the apparatus for communicating within the apparatus by fiber optic communication.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required